

APPLICANT(S): SCHILLER, Richard
SERIAL NO.: 10/798,778
FILED: March 12, 2004
Page 7

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application and were rejected. In this response, claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17 and 18 have been amended.

Claims 2, 6, 8 and 11 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve all rights in these claims to file divisional and/or continuation patent applications.

New claims 19-21 have been added in order to further define what the Applicants consider to be the invention. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter has been added.

Objections to the Title

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the title because it is allegedly not descriptive. Applicants are willing to amend the title of the invention, suggest METHOD OF CONTROLLING A VIDEO DISPLAY DEVICE and earnestly solicit the Examiner's opinion this regard.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 8, 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Terry (U.S. Patent No. 5,546,131). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

APPLICANT(S): SCHILLER, Richard
SERIAL NO.: 10/798,778
FILED: March 12, 2004
Page 8

Terry is directed to the problem of ensuring that sub-title information that has been broadcast with 4x3 television signal is not lost when the 4x3 television signal is displayed on a 16x9 display. Terry teaches that where the expansion of the picture results in the loss of sub-titles that are super-imposed on the picture (since the expansion causes a portion of the bottom of the picture to be undisplayed), the presence of subtitles is detected and the sub-titles are shifted to a displayed portion of the picture.

This is clearly different from the claimed invention, as set forth in amended independent claims 1 and 9 (Applicants note that claims 2 and 8 have been canceled). The apparatus of Terry does not receive a video signal and separate associated information to be displayed with the video signal, as required by the claim. Instead, the apparatus of Terry receives a video signal that includes, as part of the video information, subtitles super-imposed on the picture.

Specifically, there is no disclosure of the step of transforming the video signal to a second scanning raster having a different aspect ratio from the first aspect ratio, the transformation resulting in the video signal retaining the first aspect ratio within the second scanning raster and occupying only part of the second scanning raster. For example, Figures 29 and 30 of Terry clearly show that the video signal does not retain the same aspect ratio within the second scanning raster.

Thus, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Terry for the steps of receiving separate associated information at a second input and then displaying the associated information with the aspect ratio-converted video signal. In addition, since the received 4x3 picture is transformed into a 16x9 picture and the subtitles are super-imposed thereon, there is no disclosure in Terry of the transformation of the video signal resulting in the video signal retaining the first aspect ratio within the second scanning raster and occupying only part of the second scanning raster, as required by the claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that amended independent claims 1 and 9 are allowable. Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and, therefore, include all its limitations, such that claims 3 and 4 are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended independent claims 1 and 9 and to claims 3 and 4 dependent thereon.

APPLICANT(S): SCHILLER, Richard
SERIAL NO.: 10/798,778
FILED: March 12, 2004
Page 9

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 5-7, 11, 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terry (U.S. Patent No. 5,546,131) in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,788,347).

Claims 10, 13-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terry (U.S. Patent No. 5,546,131) in view of Saeger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,345,270).

Claims 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terry (U.S. Patent No. 5,546,131) in view of Saeger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,345,270) and the Background of the instant application.

Applicants note that they have canceled claims 6 and 11, and have added new claims 19-21. These new claims do not constitute new matter.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. As discussed above, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Terry of the transformation step as recited in the amended claims. Similarly, there is no disclosure or suggestion in either of the Kim et al. or Saeger et al. references of the transformation step as recited in the amended claims. Specifically, there is no disclosure in any of the cited references of the step of transforming the video signal to a second scanning raster having a different aspect ratio from the first aspect ratio, the transformation resulting in the video signal retaining the first aspect ratio within the second scanning raster and occupying only part of the second scanning raster, and the combination of Terry with any of the secondary references does not teach or suggest the recited transformation step.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 5-7 and 10-18 are not obvious over Terry in view of Kim et al., Saeger et al. or Saeger et al. and the Background. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to claims 5, 7, 10 and 12-21 and pass these claims to allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants argue that the pending claims are deemed to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone

APPLICANT(S): SCHILLER, Richard
SERIAL NO.: 10/798,778
FILED: March 12, 2004
Page 10

number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Please charge any fees associated with this paper to deposit account No. 50-3355.

Respectfully submitted,



Morey B. Wildes
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 36,968

Dated: June 21, 2007

Pearl Cohen Zedek Latzer, LLP
1500 Broadway, 12th Floor
New York, New York 10036
Tel: (646) 878-0800
Fax: (646) 878-0801